

REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action mailed June 28, 2007, which has been reviewed and carefully considered. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 11-20 remain in the present application. Claims 1-10 are cancelled without prejudice and claims 11-20 are added. Applicants reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

By means of the present amendment, the current Abstract has been deleted and substituted with the enclosed New Abstract which better conforms to U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. By means of the present amendment claim 10 has been canceled without prejudice thus rendering moot this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-7 and 9-10 are rejected under

PATENT

Serial No. 10/520,311

Amendment in Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2007

35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0125189 (Castro). Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Castro in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,417,127 (Yamamoto). Further, claims 1-10 are rejected as allegedly unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Yamamoto. It is respectfully submitted that the claims 11-20 are allowable over Castro and Yamamoto for at least the following reasons.

Castro is directed to an aluminum oxide ceramic material used for making a dental article or prosthesis. As clearly shown by the translucent, light diffused circular region in FIG 2, and recited throughout translucent Castor, such as the abstract, the Castro ceramic is. Further, Castro specifically recites that "a substantial amount of the incident light should pass through the article, albeit diffused, to the base for reflection off of the tooth surface, ... Since the article is translucent rather than transparent ..." (Paragraph [0041], emphasis added).

Thus, Castro teaches away from the present invention as recited in independent claim 11, and similarly recited in independent claims 14 and 16 which, amongst other patentable

elements, requires (illustrative emphasis provided) :

the polycrystalline alumina component ... is
transparent ..., and wherein the additive comprises Mg
oxide.

Moreover, Castro is directed to ceramics used in dental
prosthetics. One skilled in the art would not look to diffused
dental prosthetics to manufacture a discharge lamp comprising a
discharge tube having a wall of a ceramic as required by claim
independent 14 of the present application.

Yamamoto also teaches away from the present invention which
requires a transparent polycrystalline alumina component with Mg
oxide as an additive, since Yamamoto specifically recites in column
3, lines 53-55 that a:

soft metal oxide such as magnesia (MgO) ... is
not recommended to be used. (Emphasis added)

Further, claim 8 of Yamamoto specifically recites in column 3,
lines 53-55:

A translucent polycrystalline ceramic as claimed
in claim 4, wherein the polycrystalline ceramic does
not substantially contain magnesia (MgO). (Emphasis
added)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent
claims 11, 14 and 16 should be allowable, and allowance thereof is

PATENT

Serial No. 10/520,311

Amendment in Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2007

respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 12-13, 15 and 17-20 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 11, 14 and 16.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

PATENT

Serial No. 10/520,311

Amendment in Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2007

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Dicran Halajian
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Applicant(s)
September 27, 2007

Enclosure: New Abstract

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101